1	·	•
2		
3		·
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY	
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 3322
12	· ·	
13	MOHAMAD KHALIL ELREDA	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER
14		[Gov. Code, §11520]
15	Respondent.	[00v. code, §11320]
16		
17	FINDINGS OF FACT	
18	1. On or about July 20, 2009, Complainant Virginia Herold, in her official capacity as	
19	the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, filed	
20	Accusation No. 3322 against Mohamad Khalil Elreda (Respondent) before the Board of	
21	Pharmacy.	
22	2. On or about April 28, 2006, the Boar	d issued Pharmacy Technician Registration No.
23	TCH 68570 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full force and effect a	
24	all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on September 30, 2009, unless	
25	renewed.	
26		Peden, an employee of the Department of
27	3. On or about July 23, 2009, Thurman Peden, an employee of the Department of Justice, served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 3322, Statement to	
28	,	a copy of the reconstitution 170. 3322, Statement to
- 1	· ·	

Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is: 6636 Otis Ave., #1, Bell, CA 90201. A copy of the Accusation is attached Es exhibit A, and is incorporated herein by reference.

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. On or about August 31, 2009, the aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Unclaimed."
 - 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
- (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.

Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 3322.

- 7. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
- (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 8. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the evidence on file herein, finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 3322 are true.
- 9. The total costs for investigation and enforcement in connection with the Accusation are four hundred and eight dollars (\$480.00) as of August 18, 2009.

25 | ///

26 | ///

27 | ///

28 || ///

Exhibit A
Accusation No. 3322

1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of California		
2	GLORIA A. BARRIOS Supervising Deputy Attorney General LINDA L. SUN Deputy Attorney General		
3			
4	State Bar No. 207108 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702		
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-6375		
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 Attorneys for Complainant		
7			
8	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY		
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 3322		
12	MOHAMAD KHALIL ELREDA 6636 Otis Ave., #1		
13	Bell, CA 90201 Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH A C C U S A T I O N		
14	68570		
15	Respondent.		
16			
17	Complainant alleges:		
18	PARTIES		
19	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity		
20	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs.		
21	2. On or about April 28, 2006, the Board issued Pharmacy Technician Registration		
22	Number TCH 68570 to Mohamad Khalil Elreda (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician		
23	Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and		
24	will expire on September 30, 2009, unless renewed.		
25	JURISDICTION		
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following		
27	laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise		
28	indicated.		
	1		

4. Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension/expiration/surrender/cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

- 5. Section 4300 of the Code states:
- "(a) Every license issued may be suspended or revoked."
- 6. Section 4301 of the Code states:

"The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of unprofessional conduct or whose license has been procured by fraud or misrepresentation or issued by mistake.

Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

. . . .

"(f) The commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of relations as a licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.

• • •

"(I) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. The record of conviction of a violation of Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred. The board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order to fix the degree of discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances or dangerous drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this provision. The board may take action when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made

suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment."

7. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states:

"For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility license pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee or registrant if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensee or registrant to perform the functions authorized by his license or registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare."

COST RECOVERY PROVISION

8. Section 125.3 of the Code states, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Act Involving Moral Turpitude, Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Corruption)

- 9. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (f) in that he committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit and/or corruption. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. On or about April 7, 2008, in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, in the case entitled *People of the State of California v. Mohamed Elreda* (Sup. Ct., Cty. of Los Angeles, 2008, Case No. BA323948), Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to one count of violating Penal Code section 350(A)(2) (sale of counterfeit mark > \$1000), a misdemeanor. The court placed Respondent on formal probation for 3 years, and ordered him to serve 1 day in jail.

b. The circumstances of the crime are that on or about January 26, 2007, pursuant to a search warrant, Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs seized counterfeit items from Respondent's place of business, valued over \$100,000. Respondent admitted that he was selling counterfeit

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Substantially Related Crime)

Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (I) in that he was convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a pharmacy technician. Complainant refers to and incorporates the allegations contained in

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:

- Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 68570.
- Ordering Mohamad Khalil Elreda to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code
 - Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

VIRGINIA Executive Officer

Board of Pharmacy

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California

Complainant